arXiv:1704.03777v1 [cs.DS] 12 Apr 2017

Optimal strategies for weighted ray search

Spyros Angelopoulos[1] and Konstantinos Panagiotou[2]

[1]CNRS and Université Pierre et Marie Curie, Paris, France, spyros.angelopoulos@lip6.fr
[2]LMU Munich, Munich, Germany , kpanagio@lmath.lmu.de

Abstract

Searching for a hidden target is an important algorithmic paradigm with numerous applications. We introduce and study the general setting in which a number of targets, each with a certain weight, are hidden in a star-like environment that consists of m infinite, concurrent rays, with a common origin. A mobile searcher, initially located at the origin, explores this environment in order to locate a set of targets whose aggregate weight is at least a given value W. The cost of the search strategy is defined as the total distance traversed by the searcher, and its performance is evaluated by the worst-case ratio of the cost incurred by the searcher over the cost of an on optimal, offline strategy with (some) access to the instance. This setting is a broad generalization of well-studied problems in search theory; namely, it generalizes the setting in which only a single target is sought, as well as the case in which all targets have unit weights.

We consider two models depending on the amount of information allowed to the offline algorithm. In the first model, which is the canonical model in search theory, the offline algorithm has complete information. Here, we propose and analyze a strategy that attains optimal performance, using a parameterized approach. In the second model, the offline algorithm has only partial information on the problem instance (i.e., the target locations). Here, we present a strategy of asymptotically optimal performance that is logarithmically related to m. This is in stark contrast to the full information model in which a linear dependency is unavoidable.

1 Introduction

In this paper we introduce and study the following general search problem. We are given a star-like environment that consists of m concurrent *rays* of infinite length, with a common origin O. For each ray $i \in \{0, \ldots, m-1\}$, there is a *target* of weight $w_i \geq 0$ that is hidden at some distance $d_i \geq 0$ from O. Note that the setting allows cases such as $d_i = \infty$ (i.e., there is no target hidden on ray i) and $w_i = 0$ (i.e., the target has no weight). A mobile searcher (e.g., a robot) is initially located at O, and its objective is to locate a subset of targets whose aggregate weight is at least a specified value W; however the searcher has no knowledge about the instance, namely the weights of the targets and their distances from O. A *search strategy* Σ determines, at every point in time that the searcher is at the origin, a ray r and a depth l_r, such that the searcher will traverse r to depth at most l_r and will return to O. If during this search a target is found on r, the searcher will immediately return to O, and will never again traverse r, since the corresponding target has been found. In general, a search strategy has *memory*, in that the pairs (r, l_r) depend, among others, on targets already discovered by Σ.

One can evaluate the performance of a search strategy Σ by means of the well-established *competitive ratio*, which can be traced to early work by Beck and Newman in the context of the linear search problem [11]. Let $\mathcal{I}_m$ denote the set of all instances to the search problem, namely $\mathcal{I}_m = \{(W, (d_i, w_i)_{0 \leq i \leq m-1\}}) : W \geq 0, w_i \geq 0, d_i \geq 1, \text{ and } \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} w_i \geq W\}$. Note that we make two standard assumptions in the field, namely that all targets are at least a unit distance from O, and that there is a feasible solution to the instance (otherwise, it is not possible to show any guarantees on any strategy). Given $I \in \mathcal{I}_m$ the *cost of* Σ *on* I, denoted by $c(\Sigma, I)$ is defined as the total distance traversed by the searcher until the first time it discovered targets of aggregate weight at least W. We also denote by $\text{opt}(I)$ the *optimal cost of* I, namely the cost of an ideal solution that has complete knowledge of the instance I (namely, the positions of the targets and their weights, as well as W). Strategy Σ is ρ-*competitive*, for $\rho \geq 1$, if $C(\Sigma, I) \leq \rho \cdot \text{opt}(I)$, for all $I \in \mathcal{I}_m$. The competitive ratio of S is defined as

$$\rho(\Sigma) = \sup_{I \in \mathcal{I}_m} c(\Sigma, I)/opt(I), \tag{1}$$

and reflects the overhead of Σ due to lack of information. A strategy of minimum competitive ratio is called *optimal*.

Our setting is motivated by several factors. First, it generalizes several well-studied problems, most notably the (unweighted) *ray search* or *star search* problem [17, 9], in which a single target is present on some ray (unknown to the searcher). Note that ray-searching itself is a generalization of *linear search*, known informally as the cow-path problem, originally studied in [12, 10]. In addition, the weighted setting subsumes the multi-target search of [8], in which each target has unit weight, and the objective is to locate t targets, for some $t \in \mathbb{N}^+$ that is known to the strategy.

Furthermore, weighted search provides a useful abstraction of the setting in which one has to allocate resources to different tasks without advanced knowledge of the degree to which each task will prove itself fruitful. This is a fundamental aspect of many decision-making processes in everyday life. For instance, a researcher may want to determine how to allocate her time among m different projects, without knowing in advance how useful the outcome of each project will be towards a combined publication of the potential results.

Ray searching can often model settings that transcend search problems. Notable examples include: the design of *interruptible* algorithms, i.e., algorithms that return acceptable solutions

even if interrupted during their execution [13, 5]; the synthesis of hybrid algorithms based on a suite of heuristics [21]; and database query optimization (in particular, pipeline filter ordering as studied in [15]). The latter problem, although not explicitly stated as a star search problem, has in fact an equivalent search-related formulation over a star graph.

The canonical definition of competitive ratio, as expressed by (1), assumes that the offline strategy has *full information* of the instance, and thus knows on which ray each target lies. Under a relatively more recent model [22, 25], the offline strategy has only *partial information* about the instance, e.g., may know the existence of a target of weight w_i and distance d_i, but not the precise ray on which the target lies. The actual instance is thus determined by a mapping of the pairs (w_i, d_i) to the set of rays $\{0, \dots m-1\}$, which is unknown to both the online and the offline strategies. The implication is that the offline cost can be defined as the worst-case cost for achieving the objective, among all possible such mappings.

It is worth noting that the concept of weakening the optimal offline algorithm so as to obtain a more nuanced classification of algorithmic performance can be traced to earlier influential work on online computing. The general approach is to ensure that the offline algorithm knows something, as opposed to everything concerning the instance; and that this partial knowledge is still relevant and sufficient in the context of specific applications (see., e.g., the concept of *loose competitiveness* [28]). With this in mind, we should emphasize that the partial information model is not just a theoretical abstraction, but also useful in settings in which knowledge about the input is incomplete but extendable (see, e.g., the concept of *input thrifty* algorithms [22], in which input numbers may initially be known only up to some precision, and additional precision may be obtainable, albeit at a high cost).

Contribution Most of the work in this paper focuses on the full information model, which turns out to be the most challenging one. For this model, we present and analyze a search strategy strategy called AdaptiveSearch (or AdSch for brevity) for weighted ray search that attains the optimal competitive ratio. Define the function ϕ as $\phi(x) = 1 + 2(1+x)(1+\frac{1}{x})^x$, for $x > 0$. Note that $\phi(x) = \Theta(x)$, and that ϕ is increasing.

Theorem 1. *The competitive ratio of* AdSch *is* $\phi(m-1)$*, and this is the optimal competitive ratio for weighted search.*

Even though Theorem 1 is tight for some instances, it provides a very pessimistic worst-case guarantee of $\Theta(m)$. However, one expects that for many instances, much better guarantees should be attainable. We thus follow a *parameterized* approach, in which we analyze the performance of the strategy not only in terms of m, but also in terms of some natural parameters that reflect the "hardness" of the instance. A first natural parameter relates the weight objective to the maximum target weight of the instance. Given $I = \{(W, (d_i, w_i)_{0 \le i \le m-1})\}$, define $W_I = W$ and $w_{\max,I} = \max_{0 \le i \le m-1} w_i$. We show the following.

Theorem 2. *Let* $I \in \mathcal{I}_m$ *be such that* $w_{\max,I} > 0$*. If* $\lceil W_I / w_{\max,I} \rceil < m$*, then*

$$c(\text{AdSch}, I) \le \phi\left(m - \lceil W_I / w_{\max,I} \rceil\right) \cdot opt(I),$$

and $c(\text{AdSch}, I) \le (3 + 2e) opt(I)$*, otherwise. Moreover, for every strategy* Σ*, there exists* $I \in \mathcal{I}_m$ *with* $\frac{W_I}{w_{\max,I}} < m$ *such that*

$$c(\Sigma, I) \ge \phi\left(m - \lceil W_I / w_{\max,I} \rceil\right) \cdot opt(I),$$

and there exists $I \in \mathcal{I}_m$ *with* $W_I / w_{\max,I} = m$ *such that* $c(\Sigma, I) \ge 2 opt(I)$*.*

While Theorem 2 is essentially tight with respect to the parameter $\frac{W_I}{w_{\max,I}}$, we can obtain a further refinement of our analysis by considering, as parameter, the maximum number of targets that an ideal solution of optimal cost has to locate. More precisely, given $I \in \mathcal{I}_m$, let s_I denote this parameter. The choice to focus our analysis on s_I is motivated by the intuitive observation that in instances in which there are many different ideal solutions, an efficient strategy would benefit from locating the targets that correspond to an ideal solution of large cardinality. Informally, if s_I is large, then one expects that any efficient strategy will pay on many rays the same cost for finding targets as the ideal solution, and thus has an easier task. Our result reflects this intuition, in that the competitive ratio is a decreasing function of s_I, namely $\phi(m - s_I)$. More formally, we obtain the following.

Theorem 3. *Let $I \in \mathcal{I}_m$. Then*

$$c(\textsc{AdSch}, I) \leq \phi(m - s_I) \cdot opt(I), \text{ if } s_I < m,$$

and $c(\textsc{AdSch}, I) \leq (3 + 2e)opt(I)$, otherwise. Moreover, for every strategy Σ and for every $s \in \{1, \ldots, m-1\}$, there exists $I \in \mathcal{I}_m$ such that

$$c(\Sigma, I) \geq \phi(m - s_I) \cdot opt(I),$$

and there exists I with $s_I = m$ such that $c(\Sigma, I) \geq 2opt(I)$.

The extreme cases $W_I/w_{\max,I} = m$ and $s_I = m$ in the statements of Theorems 2 and 3 respectively, are special cases in which the ideal solution must locate all m targets. In this case, a small additive gap equal to $2e \cdot \mathrm{opt}(I)$ remains.

One may observe that for an instance I in which there is a subset S of targets of total weight at least W_I, with $|S|$ relatively large, and of ideal cost marginally bigger than $\mathrm{opt}(I)$, an even better analysis should be possible. Our approach can be extended to capture such situations. We refer the interested reader to the discussion in Appendix A.

It is worth noting that conceptually related parameterized analysis has been applied to standard ray searching for a single target. For example, even though the exponential strategy of [17] achieves the best competitive ratio, when parameterizing with respect to an upper bound on the distance of the target, more refined results can be obtained [23].

As often in ray search problems, we rely on a strategy that searches the rays in a *cyclic*, i.e., round-robin manner. There are two main challenges that one needs to address. The first challenge pertains to the design of the strategy itself. Unlike most previous work for unweighted search in which an optimal strategy suffices to increase the search lengths by the same factor at each step, in our setting we show later that such simple rules are very inefficient. We thus seek adaptive strategies in which the search lengths increase by factors depending on the total number of targets found by the end of each step. The second challenge lies in analyzing the strategy, since the setting is substantially more complex than the unweighted one. To this end, we relate the competitiveness of the weighted search problem to that of a related problem which we term *subset search*. The objective in the latter is to locate a certain subset of the targets, without advance knowledge of the specific subset. For this problem, which is of independent interest, we show strategies that achieve the same competitiveness as strategies that search for *any* subset of targets that has the same cardinality as the subset that is sought. This, perhaps surprising, result establishes a strong upper bound on the competitiveness of the problem and is the main technical challenge.

Concerning the partial information model, our approach is based on a competitiveness-preserving reduction from weighted search to a search problem introduced and studied in [27], namely *signed search*. In this problem, there are m targets (one per ray), each of which was weight $w_i \in \{0, 1\}$ (which can be interpreted as the "sign" of the target). The objective is to locate *at least one* target of weight 1. For signed search [27] showed a competitive ratio of $O(\log m)$. More formally, we show the following:

Theorem 4. *Under the partial information model, there is a $\Theta(\log m)$-competitive algorithm for weighted search. This bound is tight, i.e., every deterministic search algorithm has competitive ratio $\Omega(\log m)$, in this model.*

Since the full information model is much more technically challenging than the partial information model, Sections 2, 3 and 4 are dedicated to the former, whereas Section 5 focuses on the latter.

Related work Ray search has been a topic of extensive study within theoretical computer science and mathematics, with numerous applications in AI/OR. Indeed the linear search problem was one of the original problems that sparked the development of *search theory* [2, 1]. The vast majority of previous work applies to the full information model. Optimal strategies for m-ray searching were given in [17, 18, 9]. Several variants of this problem have been studied, including: randomized algorithms [26]; multi-searcher algorithms [24]; searching with turn cost [16, 4, 6], searching with probabilistic information on targets [19, 20]; searching with upper and/or lower bounds on the distance of the target from O [23, 14]; searching with probabilistic location and/or fault-tolerance [5]; and the study of new cost formulations [7, 3].

The partial information model was introduced independently in [22, 25], in the unweighted setting (i.e., $w_i = 1$, for all targets i). For the objective of locating a single target ($W = 1$) [22, 25] showed that the optimal competitive ratio is asymptotically *logarithmic* in the number of the rays. This is accomplished by a strategy which combines desirable properties of both DFS and bounded-BFS, term *hyperbolic search* in [22]. This strategy was independently studied in [25]; in addition, [25] gave randomized algorithms for locating, on expectation, "almost" k targets (more precisely, $k - \tilde{O}(k^{\frac{5}{6}})$) of them, for any given k, within a constant factor from the cost of the offline algorithm that locates exactly k targets. In terms of deterministic algorithms, and again for the unweighted setting, [8] showed an optimal strategy of competitive ratio $O(\log(m-W))$. The signed search problem (defined in Section 1) was introduced and studied in [27].

2 Preliminaries

We review some useful definitions and facts concerning the problem we study, assuming the full information model. Given an instance $I \in \mathcal{I}_m$ of WeightedSearch (WS), we denote by T_I the set of the m targets of I. A subset $S \subseteq T_I$ of targets can be formally described as a subset of the ray indices $\{0, \ldots, m-1\}$. Given $S \subseteq T_I$, we define the *total weight of S*, denoted by w_S as $\sum_{i \in S} w_i$, and the *optimal search cost of S*, denoted by d_S as

$$d_S = 2 \sum_{i \in S} d_i - \max_{i \in S} d_i.$$

The latter is the minimum cost required by the searcher to visit S assuming full information of I (note that the ray with the most distant target among targets in S is visited last, and that the searcher does not need to return to the origin). We can formally describe the optimal cost of I as

$$opt(I) = \min_{S \subseteq T_I} \{d_S : w_S \geq W\}.$$

Recall also that s_I is formally defined as

$$s_I = \max\{|S| : S \subseteq T_I, w_S \geq w, \text{and } d_s = opt(I)\}.$$

The following function will be very useful in determining the search lengths of our strategy. Define

$$b_x = 1 + \frac{1}{x} \quad \text{and} \quad b_{m,t} = b_{m-t} = 1 + \frac{1}{m-t}. \tag{2}$$

Note that for the function ϕ defined in the introduction, we have $\phi(x) = 1 + 2b_x^{x+1}/(b_x - 1)$.

Concerning the classic ray search problem, in which there is only one target, it was shown in [17] that there exists an optimal cyclic strategy with geometrically increasing lengths. More specifically, in the i-th step, the strategy searches ray $i \pmod m$ up to length $b_{m,1}^i$. The optimal competitive ratio is equal to $1 + 2\frac{b_{m,1}^m}{b_{m,1}-1} = \phi(m-1)$.

Concerning the problem in which there are m unweighted targets (one per ray), and the searcher seeks to locate a subset of t targets (where t is known), it was shown in [8] that there is an optimal cyclic strategy, which in the i-th step searches the corresponding ray up to length $b_{m-t+1,1}^i$. The optimal competitive ratio is shown to be equal to $1 + 2\frac{b_{m-t+1,1}^{m-t+1}}{b_{m-t+1,1}-1} = \phi(m-t)$, namely the same as the competitive ratio of searching for a single target in a star consisting of $m - t + 1$ rays.

3 Strategies and the Overall Approach

In this section we present the strategy for our problem, assuming the full information model, and the main approach to the analysis, namely the relation between the competitiveness of WS and SubsetSearch (SS). We formally define the latter problem as follows. The instance to the problem consists of m unweighted targets (one per ray) with the target at ray i being at distance d_i from the origin of the star, as well as a subset $S \subseteq T_I$ of the targets. The distances, as well as the subset S are not known to the searcher. The search terminates when all targets in S have been discovered; we can assume the presence of an oracle that announces this event to the searcher and thus prompts the termination. The cost of the search is defined as the total cost incurred at termination, whereas the cost of the ideal solution to the instance is the cost for locating all targets in S assuming full information of the instance, i.e., equal to d_S. The following lemma provides a useful association between the two problems.

Lemma 5. *Suppose there is a strategy Σ_s for SS such that for any instance $I_s = (S, d_0, \dots d_{m-1})$ we have that $c(\Sigma_s, I_s) \leq \rho(|S|, m) \cdot d_S$, where $\rho(|S|, m)$ is a function of $|S|, m$. Then there is a strategy A_w for* WS *such that for any instance I_w of this problem, $c(\Sigma_w, I_w) \leq \rho(s_I, m) \cdot opt(I_w)$.*

Proof. Let $I_w = \{W, (d_0, w_0), \dots, (d_{m-1}, w_{m-1})\}$ denote an instance of WS. Consider the instance I_s for SS in which m targets are at distances $d_0, \dots d_{m-1}$, and S is defined to be any subset of

targets such that $d_S = \text{opt}(I_w)$ and $|S| = s_I$. From the definition of s_I, such a set exists. Define Σ_w for WS as follows: Σ_w executes Σ_s until either an aggregate target weight of at least W has been located, or the set S itself has been discovered. Since $w_S \geq W$, it follows that $c(\Sigma_w, I_w) \leq c(\Sigma_s, I_S)$. Furthermore, since Σ_S has competitive ratio $\rho(s_I, m)$, we have that $c(\Sigma_s, I_S) \leq \rho(s_I, m) d_S$. Thus, $c(\Sigma_w, I_w) \leq \rho(s_I, m)\text{opt}(I_w)$. □

Lemma 5 demonstrates that efficient strategies for SS can be helpful in the context of WS. The main technical result in this work is the analysis of Algorithm 1, which describes a strategy that we call AdaptiveSubset (AdSub for brevity). Its performance guarantee is described in the theorem below, whose proof is given in Section 4.

Lemma 6. *Let $m \geq 2$. Given an instance I of SS in which we seek a set $S \subseteq \{0, \ldots, m-1\}$, with $S \neq \emptyset$, we have*

$$c(\text{AdSub}, I) \leq \phi(m - |S|) \cdot d_S, \quad \text{if } |S| \leq m-1, \tag{3}$$

and $c(\text{AdSub}, I) \leq (3 + 2e) \cdot d_S, \quad \text{if } |S| = m.$

Algorithm 1: Strategy AdSub for SS

```
Input: m rays labeled {0, ..., m − 1}, subset oracle O
f ← 1, r ← 0, D ← 1
repeat
    repeat
        explore the rth ray up to distance D · b_{m,f} or until a target is found
        if no target was found then
            r ← r + 1 (mod m − f + 1)
            D ← D · b_{m,f}
        end
    until a target was found
    f ← f + 1
    remove the rth ray and relabel the rays canonically from 0 ... m − f
    r ← r (mod m − f + 1)
until all targets, according to O, were found
```

Let AdSch denote the strategy for WS obtained by considering Σ_s to be AdSub in the statement of Lemma 5. Assuming Lemma 6, we show first how to obtain Theorem 1.

Proof of Theorem 1. From Lemmas 5 and 6, for all $I \in \mathcal{I}_m$,

$$c(\text{AdSch}, I) \leq \max\{3 + 2e, \phi(m-1)\} \cdot opt(I),$$

since ϕ is increasing. Moreover, $\phi(1) = 9 > 3 + 2e$, hence the upper bound follows. This bound is tight for the instance I in which there is only one target of weight w, and $W_I = w$ (i.e., standard ray searching for a single target). □

In order to prove Theorems 2 and 3, we will need the following lemma that addresses the extremes cases.

Lemma 7. *Given an instance I of* WS *for which $s_I = m$ or $W/w_{\max,I} = m$, we have $c(\text{AdSch}, I) \leq (3 + 2e)\,opt(I)$. Moreover, for every strategy Σ, there exists I such that $c(\Sigma, I) \geq (2 - \epsilon)\,opt(I)$, for arbitrarily small ϵ.*

Proof. The upper bound follows directly from the upper bounds of Lemmas 5 and 6. Remains thus to show the second part of the lemma. To this end, consider any strategy Σ that has to locate all m targets (as stipulated by the assumption). Consider any snapshot of the execution of the strategy at the moment the searcher returns to the origin, and let l_i denote the depth at which ray i has been searched. Consider an instance I in which m targets of unit weights are placed such that there is a target at distance $l_i+\epsilon$, for arbitrarily small ϵ, and $W_I = m$. Then $c(\Sigma, I) \geq 2\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} l_i + \mathrm{opt}(I)$, and for sufficiently small ϵ, we have that $2\sum_{i=0}^{m-1} l_i \geq (1+\epsilon)\mathrm{opt}(I)$, which yields the result. □

Proof of Theorem 2. The upper bound in the general case follows from Lemmas 5 and 6. For the lower bound (the general case), consider an instance I in which all targets have weight $w > 0$, and $W = tw$, for some $t \in \mathbb{R}^+$. Then any strategy must locate $\lceil t \rceil$ targets; from [8], the competitive ratio is at least $\phi(m-t) = \phi(m - \lceil \frac{W}{w_{\max,I}} \rceil)$. The upper and lower bounds in the extreme case are given by Lemma 7. □

Proof of Theorem 3. The upper bound in the general case follows from Lemmas 5 and 6. For the lower bound in the general case, given $s < m$, consider an instance I in which $W = sw$, for some $w > 0$, and there are s targets of weight w, while all other targets have weight 0. Suppose that $s-1$ of positive-weight targets are very close to the origin, and can be found at negligible cost. Thus, on this instance, weighted search is as hard as locating one target in $m-(s-1)$ rays, and thus has competitive ratio $1 + 2\frac{b_{m-s+1,1}^{m-s+1}}{b_{m-s+1,1}-1} = 1 + 2b_{m-s}^{m-s+1}/(b_{m-s}-1) = \phi(m-s)$, where the second equality follows from (2). The upper and lower bounds in the extreme case are given by Lemma 7. □

It thus remains to prove Lemma 6. Before we analyze AdSub, it is worth pointing out that some simple strategies that are known to be optimal for unweighted search, behave poorly for weighted search. Consider first a cyclic strategy that uses geometrically increasing lengths with a fixed base that may depend only on m. For an instance in which $|S|-1$ targets are very close to the origin, the performance of this strategy is the same as the performance of a strategy that searches one target in $m - |S| + 1$ rays. Since $|S|$ is not known in advance, the wrong choice of a base can have a detrimental effect on performance. For example, if b is chosen as small as $b_{m,1}$, then this strategy is $\Theta(m)$ competitive whereas the optimal strategy is $O(1)$-competitive for $|S| = m-1$; the same gap arises if b is chosen as big as $O(1)$ independent of m, and it so happens that $|S| = 2$.

Another obvious candidate is a cyclic strategy that changes the base once a target is found; more precisely, a strategy that on the i-th step searches the corresponding ray up to depth $b_{m,t}^i$, where $t-1$ represents the number of targets found at the beginning of the step. Perhaps surprisingly, this strategy, although intuitive, has unbounded competitive ratio. To see this, suppose that $|S| = 1$, and that in iteration i, the strategy finds on ray r a target that is not in S. Suppose also that the unique target in S lies on ray $(r-1) \bmod m$ and at distance $b_{m,1}^{i-1} + \epsilon$, for arbitrarily small $\epsilon > 0$. The strategy will discover this target after having spent cost at least $2b_{m,2}^{i+m-2}$ (namely, the cost for searching ray $(r-2) \bmod m$) on iteration $m+i-2$). It follows that the competitive ratio is at least $(b_{m,2}/b_{m,1})^i$, which is unbounded since i can be arbitrarily large.

The above examples demonstrate the need for an adaptive strategy that modifies the search lengths as a function of the number of targets that have been found, and ensures a smooth transition when such a modification takes place. This is accomplished in AdSub. More specifically, the strategy keeps track of the number of targets found so far (this is equal to $f-1$ in the statement of Algorithm 1). Then on each iteration, the strategy will search a ray to a length equal to $b_{m,f}$ times the length of the last ray exploration that did not reveal a target, until a new target is discovered.

4 Proof of Lemma 6

In this section we prove the main technical result, namely Lemma 6. We will use some properties of the functions ϕ and b.

Lemma 8. *For $x \geq 0$ let $\phi(x) = 1 + 2\frac{b_x^{x+1}}{b_x - 1}$, where $\phi(0) = \lim_{x\to 0} \phi(x) = 3$ and $\phi(1) = 9$. Then ϕ is increasing and for $q \in \mathbb{N}^+$, we have $\phi(q) - \phi(q-1) \geq 2e$.*

Proof. Define the function

$$h(x) = (x+1)(1+1/x)^x.$$

A simple calculation shows that $\phi(x) = 1 + 2h(x)$, and the monotonicity follows from the simple fact that $(1+1/x)^x$ is increasing. Moreover, by direct computation we obtain that $\phi(1) - \phi(0) > 2e$ and $\phi(2) - \phi(1) > 2e$.

Let

$$H(x) = h(x) - h(x-1).$$

We will argue that

$$H(x) \leq H(x-1) \quad \text{for} \quad x \geq 3. \tag{4}$$

Given (4) the claim can be shown as follows. Since $(1+1/x)^x$ is monotone increasing

$$\begin{aligned}
\lim_{x\to\infty} H(x) &= \lim_{x\to\infty} (x+1)\left(1+\frac{1}{x}\right)^x - x\left(1+\frac{1}{x-1}\right)^{x-1} \\
&\leq \lim_{x\to\infty} (x+1)\left(1+\frac{1}{x-1}\right)^{x-1} - x\left(1+\frac{1}{x-1}\right)^{x-1} \\
&= \lim_{x\to\infty} \left(1+\frac{1}{x-1}\right)^{x-1} = e
\end{aligned}$$

and analogously

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} H(x) \geq \lim_{x\to\infty} (x+1)\left(1+\frac{1}{x}\right)^x - x\left(1+\frac{1}{x}\right)^x = e.$$

Thus, $\lim_{x\to\infty} H(x) = e$. Moreover, (4) guarantees that $(H(q))_{q\in\mathbb{N}^+}$ is a decreasing sequence. All in all we get that $H(x) \geq e$ for all $x \geq 3$ and thus

$$h(x) - h(x-1) \geq e \implies \phi(x) - \phi(x-1) \geq 2e,$$

as claimed.

In order to show (4), note that it is equivalent to

$$h(x-1) \geq \frac{h(x) + h(x-2)}{2} \quad \text{for} \quad x \geq 3,$$

that is, h is concave whenever $x \geq 3$. We will argue that indeed $h''(x) < 0$ for $x \geq 3$, which shows that h is concave for $x \geq 3$, and which completes the proof. Indeed, basic calculus reveals that

$$h''(x) = \frac{h(x)t(x)}{x(x+1)}, \text{ where } t(x) = x(x+1)\log(1+1/x)^2 - 1.$$

Since $h(x)$ and $x(x+1)$ are positive it remains to show that $t(x) < 0$ for $x \geq 3$. Using the Taylor series expansion of the logarithm we infer that

$$\ln(1+y) \leq y - y^2/2 + y^3/3 - y^4/4 + y^5/5, \quad |y| < 1.$$

Thus

$$t(x) \leq x(x+1)\left(\frac{1}{x} - \frac{1}{2x^2} + \frac{1}{3x^3} - \frac{1}{4x^4} + \frac{1}{5x^5}\right)^2 - 1$$

By expanding the right-hand side we get that $t(x)$ is at most

$$\frac{\alpha_7 x^7 + \alpha_6 x^6 + \alpha_5 x^5 + \alpha_4 x^4 + \alpha_3 x^3 + \alpha_2 x^2 + \alpha_1 x + \alpha_0}{3600x^9}$$

with

$$\alpha_7 = -300, \alpha_6 = 300, \alpha_5 = -260, \alpha_4 = 1420$$

and

$$\alpha_3 = -615, \alpha_2 = 345, \alpha_1 = -216, \alpha_0 = 144.$$

This expression is less than 0 for $x \in \{3,4,5\}$. Moreover, the values of the α_i's guarantee for all $x \geq 3$

$$\alpha_n x^n + \alpha_{n-1} x^{n-1} \leq 0, \quad n \in \{7,3,1\},$$

and thus $t(x) \leq (-260x^5 + 1420x^4)/3600x^9$. However, when $x \geq 6$ this is negative ($6 \cdot 260 > 1420$), and the proof is completed. □

Lemma 9. *Let $q \in \mathbb{N}$ and $1 \leq \ell \leq q+1$. Then*

$$h_{q,\ell} = b_{q+1}^{-\ell-1}\left(\frac{b_q^\ell}{b_q - 1} + 1 + b_{q+1}\right)(b_{q+1} - 1) \leq 1.$$

Proof. Substituting the value of b_q and b_{q+1} yields after some simplifications

$$h_{q,\ell} = \left(q\Big(1 + \frac{1}{q(q+2)}\Big)^\ell + \frac{2q+3}{q+1}\Big(1 - \frac{1}{q+2}\Big)^\ell\right)\frac{1}{q+2}.$$

When viewed as a function of ℓ, $h_{q,\ell}$ is of the form $aX^\ell + bY^\ell$, for some $a, b, X, Y > 0$. The second derivative of this function is $aX^\ell \ln(X)^2 + bY^\ell \ln(Y)^2$. The positivity of a, b, X, Y implies that this is always ≥ 0, and thus $h_{q,\ell}$ is convex in ℓ; we obtain that $h_{q,\ell} \leq \max\{h_{q,1}, h_{q,q+1}\}$ for all ℓ in the desired range.

It is straightforward to verify that $h_{q,1} = 1$. In the remainder we show that $h_{q,q+1} \leq 1$, which will complete the proof. The cases $q = 1,2,3$ are also verified immediately, so we assume in the remainder that $q \geq 4$.

To bound this expression we will use that

$$(1+y)^N \leq 1 + yN + y^2N^2/2, \text{ for all } N \in \mathbb{N}_0 \text{ and } y \leq N^{-2}. \tag{5}$$

To see this, let us fix N and y as required. We will show by induction that $(1+y)^n \leq 1+yn+y^2n^2/2$ for all $0 \leq n \leq N$. The case $n = 0$ is immediate. Moreover, for $0 \leq n \leq N-1$, by applying the induction hypothesis

$$\begin{aligned}(1+y)^{n+1} &\leq (1+y)(1+yn+y^2n^2/2)\\ &= 1 + y(n+1) + (n^2 + 2n + yn^2)y^2/2,\end{aligned}$$

which establishes (5).

The above estimate implies that

$$\Big(1+\frac{1}{q(q+2)}\Big)^{q+1} \le \Big(1+\frac{1}{q(q+2)}\Big)\Big(1+\frac{1}{q+2}+\frac{1}{2(q+2)^2}\Big).$$

Moreover, using that $1-x \le e^{-x}$

$$\Big(1-\frac{1}{q+2}\Big)^{q+1} \le e^{-1}\cdot\Big(1+\frac{1}{q+1}\Big).$$

By plugging both bounds in the expression for $h_{q,q+1}$ we obtain that

$$h_{q,q+1} \le 1 - P(q)/Q(q),$$

where $Q(q) = 2q(q+2)^4(q+1)^2 > 0$ and $P(q) = \sum_{i=1}^{6} \alpha_i q^i$ is a polynomial of degree 6 (without constant term) such that

$$\alpha_6 = 2-4/e, \alpha_5 = 17-38/e, \alpha_4 = 56-144/e,$$

all > 0, and

$$\alpha_3 = 88-272/e, \alpha_2 = 66-256/e, \alpha_1 = 19-96/e,$$

all < 0. Since $\alpha_6 > 0$ the polynomial P is eventually positive, implying that $h_{q,q+1} \le 1$ whenever q is sufficiently large. However, note also that

$$4^3\alpha_i > -\alpha_{i-3}, \quad \text{for} \quad i \in \{1,2,3\}.$$

Thus $P(q) > 0$ for $q \ge 4$ and the proof is completed. □

Proof of Lemma 6. We fix some notation that we will use throughout the proof. Let $s = |S|$ and denote by t the total number of targets discovered by AdSub until all targets in S were found. That is, $f = t+1$ upon termination of the execution of the algorithm. Clearly, we have $s \le t \le m$. For each $1 \le j \le t$ we say that the strategy was in *Phase* j when the number of targets discovered was equal to $j-1$. That is, the strategy starts in Phase 1, repeats lines 4–10 in the statement until eventually a target is found, proceeds to Phase 2, repeats lines 4–10 in the statement until the second target is found, ..., and so on. Let $\ell_j \ge 1$ be the number of iterations of the loop in lines 4–10 performed in the j-th phase, $1 \le j \le t$. Note that in each Phase j, the number of rays explored unsuccessfully (i.e., without finding a target) equals $\ell_j - 1$, and in the ℓ_j-th iteration a target was discovered. Moreover, let D_j denote the distance of the j-th discovered target, $1 \le j \le t$. Since the last discovered target must be in S, we obtain the obvious bound

$$d_S \ge D_t. \tag{6}$$

A short roadmap to the proof is as follows. We assume that $|S| < m$; at the end we show how the proof has to be modified so that the case $|S| = m$ can be handled. In the first step, we derive an upper bound for the total cost incurred by the algorithm, see (7). This depends on a number of different parameters, in particular the distances of all the targets that were discovered, and the cost of the unsuccessful explorations made by the strategy. In the second step we derive lower bounds for the distances of the discovered targets depending also on the set of parameters, see (9). Note

that this is particularly useful, since the *last* discovered target is in S and provides a lower bound for d_S. In the third (and most technical) step we combine all these bounds to arrive at the desired conclusion.

We begin by deriving a bound for the total distance traversed by the searcher, and we write $c(I) = \mathrm{c}(\textsc{AdSub}, I)$ for brevity. Note that in Phase 1 the strategy explores in a cyclic fashion the rays to distances $b_{m,1}, b_{m,1}^2, \ldots, b_{m,1}^{\ell_1 - 1}$ (going through each ray twice), and then discovers a target at distance D_1. Similarly, in Phase 2 it explores the rays to distances $b_{m,1}^{\ell_1-1} b_{m,2}, \ldots, b_{m,1}^{\ell_1-1} b_{m,2}^{\ell_2-1}$ and then discovers a target at distance D_2. More generally, in Phase j, $1 \le j < t$, the distance traversed equals

$$2 \cdot \prod_{1 \le i < j} b_{m,i}^{\ell_i - 1} \cdot \sum_{1 \le i < \ell_j} b_{m,j}^i + 2D_j = 2 \cdot \prod_{1 \le i < j} b_{m,i}^{\ell_i - 1} \cdot \frac{b_{m,j}^{\ell_j} - b_{m,j}}{b_{m,j} - 1} + 2D_j.$$

(As usual, the empty product equals 1.) Similarly, and because after locating the t-th target the searcher does not return to the origin, the distance traversed in the final phase equals

$$2 \cdot \prod_{1 \le i < t} b_{m,i}^{\ell_i - 1} \cdot \frac{b_{m,t}^{\ell_t} - b_{m,t}}{b_{m,t} - 1} + D_t.$$

By writing $Y_j = \prod_{1 \le i < j} b_{m,i}^{\ell_i - 1}$, where $1 \le j \le t+1$, we thus obtain

$$c(I) = 2 \sum_{1 \le j \le t} Y_j \frac{b_{m,j}^{\ell_j} - b_{m,j}}{b_{m,j} - 1} + 2 \sum_{1 \le j < t} D_j + D_t.$$

Note that for $1 \le j \le t$

$$Y_j \frac{b_{m,j}^{\ell_j} - b_{m,j}}{b_{m,j} - 1} = (Y_{j+1} - Y_j) \frac{b_{m,j}}{b_{m,j} - 1} = (Y_{j+1} - Y_j)(m - j + 1)$$

and consequently the first sum the previous expression for $c(I)$ can be written as

$$\sum_{j=2}^{t} Y_j \Big(\frac{b_{m,j-1}}{b_{m,j-1} - 1} - \frac{b_{m,j}}{b_{m,j} - 1} \Big) - \frac{Y_1 b_{m,1}}{b_{m,1} - 1} + \frac{Y_{t+1} b_{m,t}}{b_{m,t} - 1}.$$

In total we arrive at the bound

$$c(I) \le \frac{2 Y_{t+1} b_{m,t}}{b_{m,t} - 1} + 2 \sum_{1 \le j < t} (D_j + Y_{j+1}) + D_t. \tag{7}$$

Having accomplished the task of providing an appropriate upper bound for AdSub we proceed with deriving explicit bounds for the distances of the targets located by the strategy. First, we know that in Phase j, $1 \le j \le t$, the largest distance to which a ray was explored is $Y_j \cdot b_{m,j}^{\ell_j}$. Thus

$$D_j \le Y_j b_{m,j}^{\ell_j} = Y_{j+1} b_{m,j}, \quad 1 \le j \le t. \tag{8}$$

To obtain a lower bound, suppose that the j-th discovered target was at ray $0 \le r \le m - j$. Let $1 \le j' < j$ be such that the r-th ray was explored the last time before discovering the j-th target

in Phase j'. Then there is an $1 \le x_j \le \ell_{j'} - 1$ such that this ray was explored up to a depth of $Y_{j'} b_{m,j'}^{x_j}$, and so $D_j \ge Y_{j'} b_{m,j'}^{x_j}$. The number of targets discovered between the last time the r-th ray was explored and the time where the target at distance D_j was discovered equals $j - j' + 1$ (including the target at D_j). Since the number of remaining rays in Phase j' equals $m - j' + 1$, we obtain $m - j' + 1 = (j - j' + 1) + \sum_{i=j'+1}^{j} (\ell_i - 1) + (\ell_{j'} - 1 - x_j)$. Thus, $\sum_{j' \le i \le j} (\ell_i - 1) - m + j = x_j$, and so

$$D_j \ge Y_{j'} \cdot b_{m,j'}^{-m+j+\sum_{j' \le i \le j} (\ell_i - 1)}. \tag{9}$$

Moreover, since $1 \le x_j \le \ell_{j'} - 1$ we obtain the bounds

$$\sum_{j' \le i \le j} (\ell_i - 1) \ge m - j + 1 \text{ and } \sum_{j' < i \le j} (\ell_i - 1) \le m - j, \tag{10}$$

that will be useful later. In particular, since $b_{m,h} < b_{m,h'}$ for $h < h'$ note that this implies the simpler bound

$$D_j \ge Y_j \cdot b_{m,j}^{\ell_j - m + j - 1} \quad \text{for all} \quad \ell_j \ge 1. \tag{11}$$

We introduce some additional notation to facilitate the further analysis. Combining (11) with (8) we infer that for all $1 \le j \le t$ there exist γ_j such that

$$D_j = \gamma_j \cdot Y_{j+1}, \quad \text{where} \quad b_{m,j}^{-m+j} \le \gamma_j \le b_{m,j}.$$

Moreover, let J be the set of indexes in $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}$ such that for each $j \in J$ we have that the target discovered in Phase j is in S. That is, we have $|J| = |S| - 1$ and moreover, strengthening the bound in (6)

$$d_S \ge \sum_{j \in J} D_j + D_t = \sum_{j \in J} \gamma_j \cdot Y_{j+1} + D_t. \tag{12}$$

Let also $\overline{J} = \{1, \ldots, t-1\} \setminus J$.

With this notation at hand and using (7) and (12), we have

$$\frac{c(I)}{d_S} \le \frac{\frac{2Y_{t+1} b_{m,t}}{b_{m,t} - 1} + 2 \sum_{1 \le j < t} (1 + \gamma_j) Y_{j+1} + D_t}{\sum_{j \in J} \gamma_j \cdot Y_{j+1} + D_t} \le 2 \max \left\{ \max_{j \in J} \frac{1 + \gamma_j}{\gamma_j}, H \right\} + 1, \tag{13}$$

with

$$H = \frac{\frac{Y_{t+1} b_{m,t}}{b_{m,t} - 1} + \sum_{j \in \overline{J}} Y_{j+1} (1 + \gamma_j)}{D_t}. \tag{14}$$

Here, we used the fact that for $a_1, \ldots, a_N, b_1, \ldots, b_N > 0$, we have $\sum_{i=1}^{N} a_i / \sum_{i=1}^{N} b_i \le \max_{1 \le i \le n} \{a_i / b_i\}$.

Note that the function $(1+x)/x$ is decreasing. Therefore, as $\gamma_j \ge b_{m,j}^{-m+j}$, for any $j \in J$ we have the bound $(1 + \gamma_j)/\gamma_j \le 1 + b_{m,j}^{m-j} < 1 + e < 4$. Thus

$$c(I) \le \max \{9, 1 + 2H\} \, d_S. \tag{15}$$

We will argue that $H \le b_q^{q+1} / (b_q - 1)$, where $q = m - |S|$. Since by Lemma 8 this is at least 9 if $|S| < m$, the proof will be completed in this case. In other words, the contribution from targets discovered by the strategy that belong to S is negligible. Abbreviate

$$L_{a,b} = \sum_{a \le i \le b} (\ell_i - 1) \quad \text{and} \quad Y_{a,b} = \frac{Y_{b+1}}{Y_a}.$$

Using the definition (14) of H, the lower bound (9) for D_t and the fact $\gamma_j \le b_{m,j}$ we obtain that for some $t' \le t$

$$H \le b_{m,t'}^{m-t-L_{t',t}} \left(\frac{b_{m,t} Y_{t',t}}{b_{m,t}-1} + \sum_{j \in \overline{J}} (1+b_{m,j}) Y_{j,t'} \right). \tag{16}$$

This expression is central in the forthcoming analysis and we will study detailed its behavior; this step in the proof essentially amounts to quantifying the contribution of targets discovered by the strategy that do not belong to S. We will split the last sum in two terms, corresponding to indexes that are larger or smaller than $t'+1$. Let $\overline{J}_> = \overline{J} \cap \{t', \dots, t-1\}$ and $\overline{J}_\le = \overline{J} \cap \{1, \dots, t'-1\}$. Regarding any $j \in \overline{J}_\le$, note that $Y_{j,t'} \le 1$ and hence $b_{m,t'}^{m-t-L_{t',t}} \cdot (1+b_{m,j}) Y_{j,t'} \le b_{m,t'}^{m-t-L_{t',t}} \cdot (1+b_{m,j})$. From (10) we infer that $L_{t',t} \ge m-t+1$ and so the previous expression is bounded by at most $(1+b_{m,j})/b_{m,t'}$. However, since $j \le t'$, we obtain that

$$b_{m,t'}^{m-t-L_{t',t}} (1+b_{m,j}) Y_{t',j} \le \frac{1+b_{m,t'}}{b_{m,t'}} \le 2, \quad j \in \overline{J}_\le. \tag{17}$$

That is, each of those terms – corresponding to targets in S that were found before the last time the ray on which we discovered D_t was explored – contributes at most an *additive* of 2 to the bound in (16).

To see how useful this is in bounding H we first consider the case $t' = t$. Then actually $\overline{J}_> = \emptyset$ and with (17)

$$H \le \frac{b_Q^{Q+1}}{b_Q - 1} + 2|\overline{J}|, \quad \text{where} \quad Q = m-t.$$

From Lemma 8 we know that $\frac{b_x^{x+1}}{b_x-1} - \frac{b_{x-1}^x}{b_{x-1}-1} \ge e > 2$. Inductively we obtain $H \le (b_{Q+|\overline{J}|}^{Q+|\overline{J}|+1})/(b_{Q+|\overline{J}|} - 1)$. Since $|\overline{J}| = |\{1, \dots, t-1\} \setminus J| = t-1-(|S|-1) = t-|S|$ we also infer that $Q + |\overline{J}| = m - |S|$ and thus

$$H \le \frac{b_q^{q+1}}{b_q - 1} \quad \text{where} \quad q = m - |S|, \tag{18}$$

as claimed. This completes the proof for the case $t' = t$.

The next case $t' = t-1$ is instructive as well, and will serve as the beginning of an inductive argument for all other cases. There $\overline{J}_> \subseteq \{t-1\}$. If $\overline{J}_> = \emptyset$ the we can proceed as in the previous case. Otherwise, setting again $Q = m-t$,

$$H \le b_{Q+1}^{Q-(\ell_t-1)} \left(\frac{b_Q^{\ell_t}}{b_Q - 1} + (1+b_{Q+1}) \right) + 2(|\overline{J}| - 1).$$

Note that (10) guarantees that $\ell_t \le m-t+1$. Additionally, since $\ell_t \ge 1$, by Lemma 9, the first term is bounded by $b_{Q+1}^{Q+2}/(b_{Q+1}-1)$, and proceeding as in the case $t' = t$ we obtain that also in this setting (18) holds. This completes the proof if $t' = t-1$.

The general case $t' \le t-2$ follows using an inductive argument on the difference $t-t'$, by generalizing the approach we used in the case $t' = t-1$. In this general case ($t' \le t-2$) we have similarly $\overline{J}_> \subseteq \{t', \dots, t-1\}$. Let $d = t-t' \ge 2$. We obtain inductively (on the difference d) that the only relevant case is when $\overline{J}_> = \{t', \dots, t-1\}$. Then, analogously to the case $t' = t-1$, we

have

$$H \leq \; b_{Q+d}^{Q-\sum_{x=0}^{d-1}(\ell_{t-x}-1)} \left(\frac{b_Q \cdot \prod_{x=0}^{d-1} b_{Q+x}^{\ell_{t-x}-1}}{b_Q - 1} + \sum_{y=1}^{d} (1 + b_{Q+y}) \prod_{x=y}^{d-1} b_{Q+x}^{\ell_{t-x}-1} \right) + 2(|\overline{J}| - d).$$

Note that for $y = d$ the product in the previous expression is empty, thus equals to 1. All the remaining terms within the big brackets have $b_{Q+d-1}^{\ell_{t-d+1}-1}$ as a common factor. Writing F_d for the first factor in the previous equations we obtain

$$H \leq F_d \cdot b_{Q+d-1}^{\ell_{t-d+1}-1} \cdot \left(\frac{b_Q \cdot \prod_{x=0}^{d-2} b_{Q+x}^{\ell_{t-x}-1}}{b_Q - 1} + \sum_{y=1}^{d-1} (1 + b_{Q+y}) \prod_{x=y}^{d-2} b_{Q+x}^{\ell_{t-x}-1} \right) + F_d(1 + b_{Q+y}) + 2(|\overline{J}| - d).$$

By induction, the term in the big brackets is at most

$$F_{d-1}^{-1} \cdot \frac{b_{Q+d-1}^{Q+d}}{b_{Q+d-1} - 1}.$$

Consequently, by replacing $Q + d - 1$ with $Q' = m - t' - 1$ we get that

$$H \leq b_{Q'+1}^{Q'-(L-1)} \left(\frac{b_{Q'}^{L}}{b_{Q'} - 1} + 1 + b_{Q'+1} \right)$$

with $L = \sum_{x=0}^{d-1} \ell_{t-x}$. Then (10) guarantees that $L \leq m - t + d = m - t'$, and again by Lemma 9, the expression is at most $b_{Q'+1}^{Q'+1}/(b_{Q'+1} - 1)$. Proceeding as in the case $t' = t$ we obtain that also in this setting (18) holds, and the proof is completed in the case $|S| < m$.

We finish the proof by considering the extreme case $|S| = t = m$. Here, we adapt (7) to this case. Recall that J is the set of indexes in $\{0, \ldots, t-1\}$ such that for each $j \in J$ we have that the target discovered in Phase j is in S. Thus $J = \{0, \ldots, t-1\}$ and $\overline{J} = \emptyset$ in this case. Moreover, note that $\ell_t = \ell_m = 1$, as the last remaining ray is searched until a target is found without ever again returning to the origin. Then, the bound in (7) changes to

$$c(I) \leq \frac{2Y_m b_{m,m-1}}{b_{m,m-1} - 1} + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{m-2} (D_j + Y_{j+1}) + 2D_{m-1} + D_m.$$

Note that $b_{m,m-1} = 2$. Proceeding as in (13) we get that

$$\frac{c(I)}{d_S} \leq 1 + 2 \max \left\{ \max_{j \in J} \frac{1 + \gamma_j}{\gamma_j}, \frac{2D_{m-1}}{2/3 D_{m-1}}, \frac{4Y_m}{D_{m-1}/3 + D_m} \right\}.$$

Since $D_m \geq Y_m$ and $D_{m-1} \geq Y_m/2$ by (11) the proof is completed. □

5 Weighted search under the partial information model

In this section we study weighted search in the setting in which the offline strategy has only partial information concerning the instance. More precisely, using the notation and terminology of [22], we assume that the offline algorithm knows, in addition to W, the (multi)set Λ defined as

$\Lambda = \{(d_i, w_i)_{0 \le i \le m-1}\}$; however, it does not know the exact *presentation* of this multiset. Here, a presentation of Λ determines the actual instance, namely it is defined as the mapping of each pair in Λ to a specific ray. The cost of an offline algorithm is the worst-case cost for achieving the objective (in our case, amassing an aggregate weight of at least W), among all possible presentations of Λ. The cost of the best offline algorithm is then what one may call the offline optimal cost under the partial information model, or the *intrinsic cost* as called in [22], and is denoted by $\xi(\Lambda)$.

A difficulty in analyzing weighted search algorithms stems from the fact that, unlike unweighted problems such as those studied in [25, 22, 27, 8], it is much harder to establish a closed formula on $\xi(\Lambda)$ in terms of the parameters in Λ. We bypass this difficulty by establishing a competitiveness-preserving reduction from weighted search to the *signed search* problem (formally defined in Section 1) that exploits properties of the intrinsic cost that do not require an explicit formula. We also use an algorithm for signed search due to [27] with competitive ratio $O(\log m)$; we denote their algorithm by SignedSch. More precisely, our algorithm WS for weighted search emulates SignedSch, by treating every target it locates as if it were a 0-weight target, until the algorithm has reached its weight target W.

Proof. Suppose we are given an instance I of the weighted search problem, with partial information multiset Λ. Recall that I is a specific presentation associated with Λ. Consider the execution of WS on I. Let F denote the set of targets that have been located right before WS terminates on I, and let R denote the set of remaining targets. We define a new instance, of the weighted search problem, denoted by I_W, in which every target in F is assigned weight equal to zero, and every target in R is assigned weight W. In addition, given I_W we define the instance I_s of the signed search problem in which every target that has weight W in I_W is a 1-target in I_s, and every target that has weight 0 in I_W is a 0-target in I_s. Last, let Λ_W and Λ_s denote the partial information sets associated with the instances I_W and I_s, respectively, and let ξ_w and ξ_s denote the intrinsic cost (optimum offline cost) for the weighted search and the signed search problems, respectively.

Observe that the cost of WS on I is the same as the cost of WS on I_W, which in turn is equal to the cost of SignedSch on I_s. We write this as $WS(I) = SS(I_s)$. In addition, we have $\xi_w(\Lambda) \ge \xi_w(\Lambda_W)$, since an offline algorithm with input Λ must locate at least one target in R, whereas for input Λ_W suffices to locate only one target in R. Moreover, we have that $\xi_w(\Lambda_W) = \xi_s(\Lambda_s)$, since the objective of locating targets of weight at least W given Λ_W is precisely the objective of locating one 1-target given Λ_s. To summarize the above, we have obtained that $WS(I) = SS(I_s)$ and $\xi_w(\Lambda) \ge \xi_s(\Lambda_s)$ from which it follows that

$$\frac{WS(I)}{\xi_w(\Lambda)} \le \frac{SS(I_s)}{\xi_s(\Lambda_s)} = O(\log m),$$

where the last equality is due to [27].

The lower bound of $\Omega(\log m)$ follows from the corresponding lower bound in the unweighted case, and in particular, from the construction given in [8]. □

References

[1] S. Alpern, R. Fokkink, L. Gąsieniec, R. Lindelauf, and V. S. Subrahmanian, editors. *Search theory. A game theoretic perspective.* New York, NY: Springer, 2013.

[2] S. Alpern and S. Gal. *The theory of search games and rendezvous*. Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2003.

[3] S. Alpern and T. Lidbetter. Mining coal or finding terrorists: The expanding search paradigm. *Operations Research*, 61(2):265–279, 2013.

[4] S. Angelopoulos, , D. Arsénio, C. Dürr, and A. López-Ortiz. Multi-processor search and scheduling problems with setup cost. *Theory of Computing Systems*, pages 1–34, 2016.

[5] S. Angelopoulos. Further connections between contract-scheduling and ray-searching problems. In *Proc. of the 24th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 1516–1522, 2015.

[6] S. Angelopoulos, D. Arsénio, and C. Dürr. Infinite linear programming and online searching with turn cost. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 2017. In press, available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tcs.2017.01.013.

[7] S. Angelopoulos, C. Dürr, and T. Lidbetter. The expanding search ratio of a graph. In *Proceedings of the 33rd Symposium on Theoretical Aspects of Computer Science (STACS)*, pages 9:1–9:14, 2016.

[8] S. Angelopoulos, A. López-Ortiz, and K. Panagiotou. Multi-target ray searching problems. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 540:2–12, 2014.

[9] R. Baeza-Yates, J. Culberson, and G. Rawlins. Searching in the plane. *Information and Computation*, 106:234–244, 1993.

[10] A. Beck. On the linear search problem. *Naval Research Logistics*, 2:221–228, 1964.

[11] A. Beck and D.J. Newman. Yet more on the linear search problem. *Israel J. of Math.*, 8:419–429, 1970.

[12] R. Bellman. An optimal search problem. *SIAM Review*, 5:274, 1963.

[13] D.S. Bernstein, L. Finkelstein, and S. Zilberstein. Contract algorithms and robots on rays: unifying two scheduling problems. In *Proceedings of the 18th International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence (IJCAI)*, pages 1211–1217, 2003.

[14] P. Bose, J. De Carufel, and S. Durocher. Searching on a line: A complete characterization of the optimal solution. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 569:24–42, 2015.

[15] A. Condon, A. Deshpande, L. Hellerstein, and N. Wu. Algorithms for distributional and adversarial pipelined filter ordering problems. *ACM Trans. Algorithms*, 5(2):24:1–24:34, 2009.

[16] E.D. Demaine, S.P. Fekete, and S. Gal. Online searching with turn cost. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 361:342–355, 2006.

[17] S. Gal. A general search game. *Israel Journal of Mathematics*, 12:32–45, 1972.

[18] S. Gal. Minimax solutions for linear search problems. *SIAM J. on Applied Math.*, 27:17–30, 1974.

[19] P. Jaillet and M. Stafford. Online searching. *Operations Research*, 49:234–244, 1993.

[20] M-Y. Kao and M.L. Littman. Algorithms for informed cows. In *Proceedings of the AAAI 1997 Workshop on Online Search*, 1997.

[21] M-Y. Kao, Y. Ma, M. Sipser, and Y.L. Yin. Optimal constructions of hybrid algorithms. *Journal of Algorithms*, 29(1):142–164, 1998.

[22] D. G. Kirkpatrick. Hyperbolic dovetailing. In *Proceedings of the 17th Annual European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, pages 616–627, 2009.

[23] A. López-Ortiz and S. Schuierer. The ultimate strategy to search on m rays? *Theoretical Computer Science*, 261(2):267–295, 2001.

[24] A. López-Ortiz and S. Schuierer. On-line parallel heuristics, processor scheduling and robot searching under the competitive framework. *Theor. Comp. Sci.*, 310(1–3):527–537, 2004.

[25] A. McGregor, K. Onak, and R. Panigrahy. The oil searching problem. In *Proc. of the 17th European Symposium on Algorithms (ESA)*, pages 504–515, 2009.

[26] S. Schuierer. A lower bound for randomized searching on m rays. In *Computer Science in Perspective*, pages 264–277, 2003.

[27] K. R. Tseng and D. G. Kirkpatrick. Input-thrifty extrema testing. In *Algorithms and Computation - 22nd International Symposium, ISAAC*, pages 554–563, 2011.

[28] N.E. Young. The k-server dual and loose competitiveness for paging. *Algorithmica*, 11(6):125–541, 1994.

Appendix

A A more refined parameterized analysis

One may restate Theorem 3 as follows. Let $\mathcal{I}^s \subseteq \mathcal{I}_m$ denote the set of instances of m-ray weighted search for which $s_I = s$. In other words, $\mathcal{I}_m = \cup_{i=1}^{m} \mathcal{I}_m^s$. Then Theorem 3 states that for any $s \in \{1, m-1\}$, and any $I \in \mathcal{I}_m^s$, we have that $c(\textsc{AdSub}, s) \leq \phi(m-s)\text{opt}(I)$. Furthermore, as argued earlier, this result is tight with respect to the parameter s.

While s_I is a very natural parameter on which to perform the analysis of our strategy, one may argue that there exist instances in which a more refined analysis would be desirable, if not necessary. In particular, this situation arises in an instance I of WS in which there is a set S of targets of large cardinality, for which d_S is only slightly worse than $\text{opt}(I)$. For concreteness, consider an instance I of WS in which $W = 2w$, for some $w > 0$, and there are two targets of weight w at distances D and $m-2$ targets of weights $w/(m-2)$ at distances $D/(m-2)+\epsilon$, for very small ϵ. For this instance, $s_I = 2$, and thus Theorem 3 implies that our strategy is $O(m)$-competitive. However, a better analysis should be able to yield a much more precise bound on competitiveness, namely $O(1)$, because AdSub has only a constant-factor overhead in locating the set of all "cheap" targets, as shown in Lemma 6.

We can formalize the above intuition using a yet more refined parameterized analysis. To this end, given an instance $I \in \mathcal{I}_m$ of WS, and a set of targets $S \subseteq T_I$, we define α_S to be equal

to $d_s/\text{opt}(I)$ (i.e., how much off a solution that uses S is with respect to the optimal solution). Moreover, we define $\xi(I)$ to be equal to $\min_{S \subseteq T_I : w_S \geq W}\{\phi(m-|S|)\alpha_S\}$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\xi = \{I \in \mathcal{I}_m : \xi(I) = \xi\}$. Using this notation, we can obtain the following generalization of Theorem 3, using the same line of arguments.

Theorem 10. *For any instance $I \in \tilde{I}_\xi$ of* WS*, we have that $c(\textsc{AdSch}, I) \leq \xi \cdot opt(I)$.*

Note that Theorem 10 subsumes Theorem 3. To see this, let $\mathcal{I}_m^{s,\xi} = \{I \in \mathcal{I}_m : \xi(I) = \xi \text{ and } s_I = s\}$. Then, the above definitions imply that if $I_m^{s,\xi} \neq \emptyset$, then $\xi \leq \phi(m - s_I)$. Moreover, Theorem 10 is tight (as is Theorem 3), excluding the extreme case $s_I = m$. More precisely, it is easy to see that for every ξ, there exists $I \in \tilde{\mathcal{I}}_\xi$ such that any strategy on I has cost at least $\xi \cdot \text{opt}(I)$, using an argument very similar to the tightness of Theorem 3. Figure 1 illustrates the parameterization of the results described in the two theorems.



Figure 1: Illustration of the parameterized results in this paper. For any instance $I \in \mathcal{I}_m^i$, strategy AdSub is $\phi(m-i)$-competitive; moreover, for all $I \in \mathcal{I}_m^{i,\xi} \subseteq \mathcal{I}_m^i$, the strategy is ξ-competitive.